in Trivandrum having been transferred more than four or five times during the course of the current year and, if so, will the Government be pleased to state the cause of such transfers?

(*b*) Will the Government be pleased to place on the table a statement showing the transfers of medical officers ordered during 1097 and the cost Government have incurred thereby?

MR. S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR: (*a*) and(*b*) A statement* containing the information asked for is laid on the table. The officers transferred more than four or five times were mostly temporary men employed on relieving duty.

PROHIBITORY ASSESSMENT UNDER THE LAND CONSERVANCY REGULATION.

32. MR. C. P. KOCHUKUNJU PILLAI: (*a*) Are the Government aware of the provision in the rules under the Land Conservancy Regulation regulating the levy of prohibitory assessment at ten times the normal rates of assessment *for the whole period of occupation*?

(*b*) Will the Government be pleased to reduce the amount of prohibitory assessment to twice the normal assessment?

(*c*) Will the Government be pleased to amend the rules so that prohibitory assessment need be realised only for three years or at least for five years as in the case of *puduval* arrears?

MR. S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR: (*a*) (*b*) and (*c*) Rules 7 and 13 of the Rules under the Land Conservancy Regulation have been revised more or less on the lines suggested by the member and a copy of the Notification† amending the rules is laid on the table.

WORKING OF THE LAND CONSERVANCY REGULATION.

33. MR. T. K. VELU PILLAI: (1) Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) how many irrigation tank beds and channel beds have been restored to their original condition by the eviction of trespassers under the provisions of the Land Conservancy Regulation, IV of 1091; and

(*b*) the extent of *poramboke* land recovered from unauthorised occupants and the amount of money realised from them by way of fines and prohibitory assessment from the 1st Chingam, 1092, the date on which the above Regulation came into force?

(2) Will the Government be pleased to state if, in view of the provisions of Regulation IV of 1091 regarding fines (Section 6), levy of

---

* Vide Appendix I—page 417.

†Vide Appendix II—page 418.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

APPENDIX II.

[*Vide* ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 32.]

Dis. No. 814 of 1922/Revenue, dated the 18th July, 1922.

NOTIFICATION.

Under sanction of His Highness the Maha Raja, it is hereby notified that Rules 7 and 13 of the Rules passed under Section 11 of the Land Conservancy Regulation, IV of 1091, under date the 6th August, 1921/22nd Karkadakam, 1096 and published at pages 769 to 771, Land Revenue Department Sheet of the Gazette, dated the 9th August, 1921, are revised as follows.

Rule 7. The following instructions are laid down for the guidance of Division Peishkars and other authorised officers in dealing with unauthorised occupation of lands which are the property of Government:

I. Assessment should be imposed invariably in all cases of unauthorised occupation. If the land occupied is the property of Government other than *poramboke*, the assessment to be imposed shall be at the ordinary rates prescribed in Rule 13. In cases of occupation of *poramboke*, if the occupation is unobjectionable, it should be dealt with under the provisions of rule 9 (i) or (ii) *infra*. If, however, the occupation is objectionable, the assessment to be levied should be prohibitory, *i. e.*, a multiple of the assessment prescribed in rule 13 for the corresponding Government land other than *poramboke*. This multiple may be fixed in each case at the discretion of the Division Peishkar, but it should in no case exceed *five* times the ordinary rates of assessment. Prohibitory assessment should be imposed only on the land, and not on any trees standing thereon. *Kudichika* or back arrears of assessment on the land, whether ordinary or prohibitory, under Section 7 (1) or 7 (2) of the Regulation, shall be charged for the period of occupation, but they shall in no case be recovered from more than five years.

II. In regard to the imposition of fines which should be in addition to the assessment, the chief distinction to be drawn is between objectionable and unobjectionable occupations. No fine need be imposed in a case which is considered to be unobjectionable by the Division Peishkar or other authorised officer, while the fine to be imposed in an objectionable case should be really deterrent.

III. In deciding whether an occupation is objectionable or unobjectionable, the instructions contained in Rules 4, 9, 38, 43 and 44 of the Revised Puduval Rules, dated 31st March, 1921, should be carefully borne in mind.

Rule 13. The ordinary rates of assessment to be charged under Rule 7 above, in the case of unauthorised occupations of any land which is the property of Government, whether a *poramboke* or not, are fixed as follows:

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(*a*) *For dry lands.*

(i) In rural areas, the assessment shall be subject to a minimum rate of 7 fanams and a maximum of 15 fanams per acre, as per schedule given below:—

Taram.	*Rate per acre.*		*Taram.*	*Rate per acre.*	
	Fs.	Chs.		Fs.	Chs.
I.	15	...	IV.	10	...
II.	13	...	V.	8	2
III.	11	2	VI.	7	...

(ii) Within the limits of municipal towns—Rs. 7 chs. 4 per acre.

If the lands contain taxable trees, they shall be also brought under assessment as per rates in the schedule given below, and allowance shall be made in fixing land assessment for the area covered by such trees according to the scale shown in the last column of the schedule:

Name of tree.	*Class.*	*Chs.*	*Cash.*	*Places where assessed.*	*Allowance of area per tree.*
Cocoanut	I	4	„	Assessed throughout the State.	1 cent.
	II	3	8		
	III	3	„		
Areca		„	8	Do.	1/8 cent.
Jack		4	„	Do.	2 cents.
Palmyra		„	8	1. Tovala. 2. Agastisvaram. 3. Eraniel. 4. Kalkulam. 5. Vilavankod. 6. 2 Villages in Neyyattinkara taluk, *viz.*, Kulattur and Parassala. 7. Shencottah.	1/5 cent.
Tamarind		2	„	1. Tovala. 2. Agastisvaram. 3. Eraniel. 4. Kalkulam. 5. Shencottah. 6. Anchanad.	2 cents.
Punna		„	12	1. Tovala. 2. Agastisvaram. 3. Eraniel. 4. Kalkulam. 5. Vilavankod.	2 cents.
Mango		„	12	1. Tovala. 2. Agastisvaram. 3. Eraniel. 4. Kalkulam. 5. Shencottah.	2 cents.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. K. C. MammenMappillai.]

(*b*) *For wet lands.*

The rate of assessment shall be fixed on the basis of the schedule of the settlement rate for wet lands and on the analogy of the registered *pandarapattom* wet lands in the neighbourhood, provided that the whole of the paddy assessment shall be commuted into money at chs. 11 per para.

By order,
R. KRISHNA PILLAI,
Ag. Chief Secretary to Government.

Huzur Cutcherry,
Trivandrum, 18th July, 1922.

The Council then resumed the consideration of the budget for 1098.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.—(*Contd.*)

DEMAND XI—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR: Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 7·21 lakhs under Demand XI—Administration of Justice.

Motions 63 to 65.

The following motions were not made:

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI:

63. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,054 for establishment in the High Court by Rs. 100.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI:

64. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 56,325 for establishment in the District and Sessions Courts by Rs. 100.

MR. G. PARAMESVARAN PILLAI:

65. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 24,780 for establishment in Magistrates' Courts by Rs. 100.

Motion 66.

MR. K. C. MAMMEN MAPPILLAI: Sir, I beg to make the following motion:

66. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,272 for the Law College Hostel.

The Law College Hostel, as you are aware, is intended only for caste Hindus. I would earnestly and respectfully request the Government either to make provision in the hostel for students of all the communities represented in the college or to remove the invidious distinction by abolishing the hostel altogether, so that the cause of soreness in some of the communities may be removed. All the communities are equally entitled to the protection and consideration of Government, and in the interests of peace and concord in the country, it seems highly undesirable that a hostel of this nature should be provided for students belonging to one particular community or certain communities only. I therefore submit that Government be pleased to take into consideration my suggestion that either arrangements be made for students of all communities by providing separate kitchen accommodation or this item be altogether omitted from the budget.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly